

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA  
WESTERN DIVISION  
No. 5:08-CV-373-D

WORLDWIDE LANGUAGE )  
RESOURCES, INC., )  
 )  
Plaintiff, )  
v. )  
 )  
MISSION ESSENTIAL PERSONNEL, )  
LLC, et al., )  
 )  
Defendants. )

**ORDER**

On October 8, 2008, the court held a hearing concerning all pending motions. For the reasons stated in open court and incorporated herein by reference, the court grants in part and denies in part defendant Mission Essential Personnel, LLC's ("MEP") motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction [D.E. 5]. The court finds and concludes that this court lacks general jurisdiction over MEP.

As for specific jurisdiction, the court finds and concludes that it has specific jurisdiction over plaintiff's tortious interference with economic advantage claim (i.e., count 5), plaintiff's unfair and deceptive trade practices claim (i.e., count 2) as it relates to the facts underlying the alleged events in North Carolina concerning the tortious interference and raiding scheme, and plaintiff's unfair competition claim (i.e., count 3) as it relates to the facts underlying the events in North Carolina concerning the tortious interference and raiding scheme. The alleged events in North Carolina concerning the tortious interference and raiding scheme are described in the complaint at paragraphs 38–50.


As for plaintiff's tortious interference with contract claim (i.e., count 4), the court finds and concludes that it lacks specific jurisdiction over this claim. This claim concerns an alleged

tortious interference with a contract between plaintiff and defendant Ruzgani. See Compl. ¶¶ 89–94. The alleged tortious interference with Ruzgani’s contract took place in Afghanistan and is distinct from any alleged tortious interference and raiding scheme in North Carolina. See Compl. ¶¶ 38–50. Further, to the extent plaintiff’s unfair and deceptive trade practices claim (i.e., count 2) and unfair competition claim (i.e., count 3) relate to the alleged tortious interference with a contract between plaintiff and defendant Ruzgani, the court lacks specific jurisdiction over such claims.

As for pendent personal jurisdiction, the court has considered whether to exercise pendent personal jurisdiction over count 4 against MEP and counts 2 and 3 against MEP as those claims relate to the alleged tortious interference with Ruzgani’s contract. In its discretion, the court finds and concludes that exercising pendent personal jurisdiction over these claims would not be appropriate. These claims arise from a distinct set of operative facts than the alleged events in North Carolina concerning the tortious interference and raiding scheme.

Finally, for the reasons stated in open court and incorporated herein by reference, the court denies plaintiff’s motion for a preliminary injunction [D.E. 20].

SO ORDERED. This 9 day of October 2008.

  
JAMES C. DEVER III  
United States District Judge